

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/299,562	HEGEDUS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Sandra Wegert	<b>Art Unit</b> 1647	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sandra Wegert  
 (2) Siu Lo.

(3) Elizabeth Kemmerer  
 (4) David Wallace

Date of Interview: 08 July 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 95.

Identification of prior art discussed: yes, Sato, 1988

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

\* Discussed defining product in Claim 95 by a process, or other well-defined description.  
 - Discussed proposed Claim, esp. in terms of controlled aggregation state.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Sandra Wegert  
 Examiner's signature, if required